

Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.

Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-07/msg01250.html>

- *From:* "Spaceman" <spaceman@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 14 Jul 2008 12:59:14 -0400
-

PD wrote:

On Jul 14, 11:36 am, "Spaceman" <space...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

PD wrote:

On Jul 14, 10:50 am, "Spaceman" <space...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

PD wrote:

On Jul 14, 10:21 am, "Spaceman" <space...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Sue... wrote:

On Jul 13, 11:27 pm, "Spaceman" <space...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

You see, the basic atomic clock actually has to

Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.

use
gravity
to
get
it's
most
accurate
reading.
They
actually
have
a
"fountain"
almost
like
a
water
fountain
only
it
is
forcing
a
very
tiny
ball
or
atoms
upward
and
it
has
to
use
gravity
to
return
down
and
be
counted
as
one
second.

If
you
actually
take

Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.

the
silly
thing
and
flip
it
upside
down,
It
is
as
good
as
any
pendulum
clock
of
yesteryear.
It
simply
won't
work
right.
Isn't
that
funny?
Want
to
read
about
it
also.

<http://tf.nist.gov/cesium/fountain.htm>

Do
the
cesium
clocks
on
the
GPS
satellite
vehicles
use
a
fountain?

Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.

Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.

Not sure
and
probably
not the
same,
but
something
in the same
sort of form
must be
going on.
and cesium
atoms are
not immune
to
gravitational
effects so
fountain or
not, the
atom will
still be
subject
to g forces.
Unless
cesium is
immune to
g-forces
like some
special alien
spaceship
would be.
:)

Already discussed. Time
dilation appears in cases
where the atoms
are moving and not moving
and both are in the *same*
gravitational
field, and so the "g-forces"
are not responsible for the
time
dilation.

Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.

Not moving (at rest) on a curved path and
moving along a curved path
are a difference in g-forces.

I wasn't talking about a curved path, Spaceman. I was
referring to
straight line motion, both under the *identical* terrestrial
gravitational field.

Now PD proves he does not understand that a truly straight line
motion can not stay in the same "terrestrial gravitational field".
A truly straight path would have to cross into higher or lower
gravitational potentials.
Sheesh

Nice try, Spaceman!
But the time dilation for *different* speeds in the same channel,
through the *identical* gravitational profile, follows the
expectations of SR. That is, you get what SR predicts for speeds of
0.5c, 0.8c, 0.9c, and 0.99c, even though they are in the very same
beampipe through the same variation in gravitational field.

What "beampipe" are you talking about PD?
Any truly straight line can not be in the same gravitational force
from beginning to end.
and...
Why don't you get that I am not saying the predictions are wrong
at all. I am merely saying that the actual changes that the clocks
are showing are not caused by this stupid ass spacetime cause you
worship like an Easter bunny.
The actual cause is the same cause that makes pendulum clocks
goof up too. A g-force change.
Sheesh

—
James M Driscoll Jr
Spaceman

.

Re: A silly fact about an atomic clock that relativist never want you to know.